



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,989	04/02/2002	Reiner Fischer	Mo7057/LeA34,002	3254

34469 7590 06/27/2003

BAYER CROPSCIENCE LP
100 BAYER ROAD
PITTSBURGH, PA 15205

EXAMINER

LEVY, NEIL S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10087989

Applicant(s)

REINER et al

Examiner

NTL/cm

Group/Art Unit

16/6

6

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/27/03
- ☐ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-8 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-8 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1616

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I. claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, drawn to as composition, method of use, ~~and~~ method of preparation.

Group II. Claim(s) 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, drawn to a composition, method of use and method of preparation.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- 1) X¹; the ultimate form or moiety i.e. – Cl
- 2) Y¹; the ultimate form or moiety i.e. – H
- 3) Z¹; the ultimate form or moiety i.e. – C₆ alkyl
- 4) N; 0, 1, 2 or 3;
- 5) A¹; the ultimate form or moiety i.e. – H
- 6) B¹; the ultimate form or moiety i.e. – H
- 7) G¹; the ultimate form or moiety i.e. – H or identify each of R¹, R², R³, R⁴, R⁵, R⁶, R⁷, to identify the ultimate form or Moiety of G¹.
- 8) species of agonist or antagonist

9) agonist, if elected; 07 antagonist, if elected, ultimate compound: one of 11a – 11 m, as at claim 8.

The inventions listed as Groups I, II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Applicant claims synergistic effects, but no evidence is seen that any of the array of possible permutations and combinations of compounds of formula 1, with any unspecified agonist or antagonist, or with a specified compound of claim 8, will in fact provide an unexpected 10 times or greater (synergistic) effect on any given pest species. Thus, the special technical feature of a combination of each of the formula (1) variants with each of claim 8 compounds to provide extra ordinary effective control on a pest is absent.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species of each of species 1) through 9), to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over

Art Unit: 1616

the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Since this application is filed under Rule 371, the legal authority is PCT Rule 13.2, Annex B, Part 1(f) "Markush Practice"; PCT Rule 13 and 35 U.S.C. § 372, rather than 35 U.S.C. § 121.

Because the above restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call to applicant's agent to request an oral election was not made. See M.P.E.P. Sec. 812.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil Levy whose telephone number is (703) 308-2412. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday 7 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jose Dees can be reached on (703) 308-4628. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 872-9307 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Levy/LR
June 13, 2003



NEIL S. LEVY
PRIMARY EXAMINER